



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO.  | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.      | CONFIRMATION NO.       |
|--|-------------|----------------------|--------------------------|------------------------|
| 10/755,338   | 01/13/2004  | Kenneth J. Young     | 84731 3085 KAW           | 1232                   |
| 20736 7590 01/17/2008<br>MANELLI DENISON & SELTER<br>2000 M STREET NW SUITE 700<br>WASHINGTON, DC 20036-3307 |             |                      | EXAMINER<br>KIM, TAE JUN |                        |
|  |             |                      | ART UNIT<br>3746         | PAPER NUMBER           |
|  |             |                      | MAIL DATE<br>01/17/2008  | DELIVERY MODE<br>PAPER |

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

# Interview Summary

Application No.

10/755,338

Applicant(s)

YOUNG, KENNETH J.

Examiner

Ted Kim

Art Unit

3746

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Ted Kim.

(3) \_\_\_\_\_.

(2) Warren Taltavull.

(4) \_\_\_\_\_.

Date of Interview: 10 January 2008.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference  
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☐ No.  
If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) discussed: 1 and 2.

Identification of prior art discussed: Hussey.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

  
Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: In particular, claim 2 was discussed and its interpretation. The examiner's position is that Claim 2 since it relies on the relationship between the nozzle cross section and the cross section of the air flow directly impinging upon the nozzle relies upon functional language as there is nothing structural to define the cross section of the airflow. When considering the structural features of the application, it is clear that the cross section of the fuel nozzle is greater than the diffuser exit cross section (see Fig. 1) and that the flow impinging on the nozzle forms two zones, that of direct impingement and non-direct impingement (see Fig. 2). When these structural features to form the cross section of the airflow are defined, the relationship between the cross sections in claim 2 would be better defined and given greater patentable weight.